Location, Location, Location: Does Place of Work Really Matter?

Tom Redman *, Ed Snape ** and Colin Ashurst*,

* Durham Business School, Durham University

United Kingdom

** Department of Management,

Hong Kong Baptist University,

Hong Kong Special Administrative Region,

People's Republic of China

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to: Tom Redman, Durham Business School, University of Durham, Mill Hill Lane, Durham City, DH13LB

Tom.Redman@Durham.ac.uk

Location, Location, Location: Does place of work really matter?

This paper examines the work attitudes of home- and office-based workers. A review of the existing literature finds both pessimistic and optimistic accounts of the impact of homeworking on employee attitudes and behaviors. Drawing on a survey of 749 managerial and professional employees in knowledge intensive industries, the study finds more support for the optimistic perspective. The findings suggest that homeworking is positively associated with employee wellbeing and a more balanced work-home relationship. There is no evidence that organizational citizenship behaviours are reduced by homeworking but there is some support for homeworking undermining employees' perception of the organization as supporting their careers and personal development.
.

Key words: spatial flexibility, homeworkers, wellbeing, work-life balance, organizational citizenship behaviour, knowledge workers

Introduction

Many futurists' visions of work predict a functionally flexible, transitory and portable workforce, especially for those employed in the knowledge-based industries (e.g. Knell, 2000). The debate suggests that organizations need to be more agile and nimble in order to survive in hyper-competitive and global markets, so that flexibility has become something of an organizational panacea, facilitating firms' rapid adaptation to market conditions in highly competitive and rapidly changing environments. Organizational flexibility is often seen as an effective solution to many managerial problems, from cost control to coping with skill shortages. Paralleling managerial interest, research on organizational flexibility has grown rapidly of late. There are now large literatures on labour flexibility, especially on the three categories identified by Atkinson's (1984) model of the flexible firm namely, numerical, functional and pay flexibility. In this study we are concerned with a rather neglected aspect of the labour flexibility debate, homeworking in the new knowledge based economy.

The study of homeworking has a long history in many traditional sectors and studies have examined the work and family lives of homeworkers at all levels in the organization from the highly skilled free-lance professional to the outsourced pieceworker. There is a growing literature on the impact of employers' use of flexibility on employee attitudes and behaviours. There is research on, for example, numerical flexibility through temporary staffing, and the use of agency staff, interims, and sub-contractors (Benson, 1998; Moorman and Harland, 2002; Liden et al 2003); functional flexibility (Berg and Velde, 2005; Cordery et al 1993); and pay flexibility (Tremblay, Sire and Pelchat, 2004). However, we can locate no equivalent studies which systematically compare the work attitudes of home- and office-based workers. Although the study of alternative location working and especially homeworking is well developed, the dominant methods of inquiry into the working lives of homeworkers has been via the secondary analysis of large data sets and through in-depth qualitative studies, usually interview based, rather than through survey-based research designs.

Thus, using data sets such as the Labour Force Survey (Felstead et al, 2001) and WERS (Felstead et al, 2002), we have analyses of the growth of alternative location working, the types of occupation and industries such working occurs in, and the types of individual involved in working from home and office. Equally, from the richly detailed work of qualitative researchers (Tietze and Musson, 2006; Halford 2005; Beach, 1989), we have a balanced insight into the pitfalls and problems of homeworking in comparison to the rather rosy picture constructed by past research. However, such studies have left an important gap in our knowledge of the impact of spatial location on employee wellbeing, work-life balance and outcomes such as willingness to engage in extra role behaviours, intent to quit and absenteeism. In this paper, we draw on a survey of managerial and professional employees in

knowledge based industries to address these research gaps. Our key contribution is to evaluate the impact of home- versus office-based working on employee work attitudes and behaviours. We seek to answer the following question: does the location of work (office or home) really matter to knowledge workers?

Literature and hypotheses

The benefits of flexibility for organizational performance are now generally well established (Hatum and Pettigrew, 2006; Desombre et al 2006). However, we know less about the impact of organizational flexibility on those who are required to be the most flexible; the worker. In general two broad, and very different, accounts can be found on the future of work for the flexible worker. First, a rather pessimistic account of the flexible worker portrays the work experience as one where individuals are part of a "degraded" workforce. Labour historians' accounts of homeworking and "putting out" work systems have often condemned homeworking as an essentially exploitative process (Boris, 1994). Homeworkers in manual occupations are disproportionately made up from women and ethnic minority workers, who may be especially vulnerable to exploitation (Felstead and Jewson, 2000). Recent studies of homeworkers have emphasized the continuing potential for exploitation, reporting examples of disadvantaged work groups with low pay, high levels of job insecurity and poor benefits (Phizacklea and Wolkowitz, 1995; Heyes and Gray, 2001; Jurik, 1998). Homeworker exploitation has continued despite coordinated approaches involving codes of practice, ethical trading initiatives, anti-sweat shop campaigns, campaigns for legislative protection and organizing drives by unions and NGO's such as the National Group on Homeworking (Williams, 2005).

Second, a more optimistic view sees the emergence of a new type of homeworker; the flexible knowledge worker. Such individuals are seen as highly valued "free workers" (Donnelly, 2006; Knell, 2000), who are independent, empowered and posses high-levels of self-generated human and social capital, and who can determine their own working arrangements. Many observers have welcomed the growth of homeworking as a potentially liberating structure for workers, as a means of breaking away from oppressive employment practices. There are several upbeat accounts of the new professional homeworker (Berke, 2003). According to Hardhill, popular writing on technology-enabled homeworking stresses "the freedom, flexibility and new opportunities it gives" (2003:156). In these accounts, homeworking is viewed as a family-friendly work practice that results in better work-life balance, an ability to combine child rearing and career development, reduced stress levels, and reduced levels of conflict between work and home (Huws, 1993). In addition, absence and quit rates are argued to be much reduced by homeworking, as the demands of work and home are more easily accommodated due to the greater flexibility provided (Frolick et al, 1993; Bricknell, 1996).

Systematic evaluation of the optimistic and pessimistic perspectives as they apply to the spatially flexible new knowledge worker are few and far between. There is large-scale panel data evidence on "atypical" flexible workers, suggesting that such employees do not have reduced levels of wellbeing (measured in terms of health and life and job satisfaction) when compared to traditionally employed workers (Bardasi and Francesconi, 2003). However, this study only examined flexibility in terms of part-time versus full-time and temporary versus permanent contract work patterns, rather than considering work location.

Felstead et al's (2002) analysis of the employee data from WERS 98 examined the attitudes of those "entitled" to work at home compared to those "denied" the opportunity to work from home. For non-manual employees the "entitleds" had significantly higher levels of job influence, positive perceptions of the workplace climate, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction but also reported higher levels of work intensification. However, the concern here is that we may not be picking up a location effect as such, but rather an empowerment impact, as it is not clear how many of the entitleds actually did work from home. In fact, the evidence suggests that few of those entitled to work at home for part of their working week take advantage of the opportunity (Perlow, 1997; Hochschild, 1997).

Explanations for this lack of take up of homeworking have centred on the need to be present at work for individual performance evaluations in "face time" work cultures (Bailyn, 1993). Face time work cultures are defined by Kossek (2003) as where time spent at work is seen as a signal of an individual's level of productivity and organizational commitment. Hoschschild (1997) offers a different explanation for this lack of take up, arguing that workers are voting with their feet – and the workplace wins. The modern organizational culture for professional workers is argued to be a large pull factor as its makes such workers feel valued and appreciated. In contrast, home life with its struggles for space, interruptions, noise and domestic squabbles has been seen as "nothing short of a torment" (Coverdill, 2000: 234).

In assessing this rather limited evidence on the impact of work location on employee attitudes and behaviors, it is clear that there are both disadvantages and advantages for the individual employee in homeworking. Daniels et al (2001: 1152) hypothesize a range of individual costs

and benefits associated with increased teleworking. The main costs for employees include fewer chances for promotion and training/development, more routine work, increased conflict between work and home, limited face to face contact with colleagues, increased social isolation, reduced job security and more time spent working. The benefits of teleworking for the individual are suggested to be more time for home and family, greater job autonomy, less commuting and stress, and more flexible work hours.

In sum, it seems that the consequences of increased homeworking on employees are most evident in four areas; employee wellbeing; career progression and opportunities for training and development; family-friendly working; and levels of employee work effort and absence. Amongst managerial and professional employees in the knowledge intensive industries, we may expect findings to be in line with the more optimistic conceptualization of the impact of alternative work location, that in general homeworking will be associated with higher levels of employee wellbeing. We conceptualize employee wellbeing broadly as involving job and life satisfaction, feelings of empowerment and organizational commitment, and having a positive mood state and low levels of stress, emotional burnout, absenteeism, and organizational withdrawal cognitions.

Based on these arguments, we hypothesize as follows:

Hypothesis 1: After controlling for total hours worked, there will be a positive association between the level of hours worked at home and: a). job satisfaction, b). life satisfaction, c). psychological empowerment, d). organizational commitment). positive affect, and a negative

association with f). organizational withdrawal cognitions, g). absenteeism h). stress and i). emotional burnout.

The exception to this positive impact on employee wellbeing is that homeworking appears be associated with reduced career and training and developments opportunities. Here the strong linking of career and developmental opportunities to informal and closed discussions in the workplace (e.g. Harris and Brewster, 1999) is argued to favour the office based-worker over the homeworker.

Hypothesis 2: After controlling for total hours worked, there will be a negative association between the level of hours worked at home and employee's perceptions of organizational support for careers and training and development.

The nature of the relationship between work and family life has been one of the most widely debated topics in management over the last decade or so. A general consensus has emerged in the literature that work-life balance is improved by homeworking (Baines and Gelder, 2003; Felstead, Jewson, Phizacklea, and Walters, 2002; Sullivan and Lewis, 2001; Beach, 1989). The general argument is that not only does homeworking provide the homeworker with the advantages deriving from greater control and flexibility in relation to the pace and timing of work but that it insulates them from a range of stresses emerging from office based working such as long hours spent commuting and competitive peer pressure in the workplace (Green, 2001).

Hypothesis 3: After controlling for total hours worked, there will be a positive association between the level of hours worked at home and a). employee's perceptions of family supportive organizational practices and a negative association with b). family-to-work and c). work-to-family conflict.

We also examine the relationship between alternative location working hours and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Organizational citizenship behaviour is strongly associated with organizational performance across a wide range of measures (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997). Some organizational citizenship behaviors are targeted at helping the organization, so-called OCB-Organizational (OCB-O). These include highly cooperative behaviors which help increase efficiency and productivity, such as volunteering for things that are not absolutely required by the job and making innovative suggestions to improve quality or reduce waste (Organ, Podsakoff, and Mackenzie, 2006). Such behaviors go beyond basic compliance with job requirements, to include discretionary behaviors which reflect a highly cooperative adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of organizational requirements. Another category of OCB's involve helping specific individuals within the organization, usually co-workers. Labelled as OCB-Individual (OCB-I), such behaviours include helping new co-workers settle into the job.

We can find no studies that have examined the citizenship behaviours of alternative location workers, but drawing from contact theory as a predictive explanation of behavior at work (Gutek, Cohen and Konrad, 1990), the suggestion is that physical proximity and frequent contact with the organization are necessary to develop the underpinning attachment needed to engage in citizenship behaviours directed at helping the organization. There is some evidence

from research on "hot desking" – where employees are not assigned dedicated workspaces, but work from any desk that happens to be vacant – that physical location has significant implications on the way in which employees engage with the organization (Millward, Haslam and Postmes, 2007). Employees with assigned desks had higher levels of organizational and team identification than those without a desk. This argument suggests that the more distal homeworking will be less strongly associated with OCB behaviors, such that those who spend a higher proportion of their time working at home may actually show lower levels of OCB-O than their colleagues who work mainly from the office. An additional argument, over and above the differing motivational bases for OCB of home and office based workers, does not depend on the logic that homeworkers are unwilling or less motivated to perform these extra role behaviours, but that their physical separation from the organization and from their co-workers reduces their opportunity to engage in such extra-role behaviors, either OCB-O or OCB-I. Thus, we hypothesize as follows:

Hypothesis 4: After controlling for total hours worked, there will be a negative association between the level of hours worked at home and organizational citizenship behavior.

Method

Sample. Alternative location working is most common in managerial and professional occupations and in knowledge intensive industries (Felstead et al, 2002). Thus a self-completion web-based questionnaire was administered to an appropriate sample of managerial and professional employees in knowledge intensive organizations during July 2006. The sample was drawn from the client list of a UK management consultancy firm

specializing in the knowledge intensive sector. A total of 918 responses were received by the cut off date, and following deletion of cases with missing values, 749 were usable. The median age of respondents was 30-39; the median organizational tenure was 3-4 years and job tenure 1-2 years. Thirty-eight percent of respondents were female, with sixty-six percent married or living as married. Twelve percent of the sample were board level managers, 26 percent were senior managers, 26 percent were middle managers, 13 percent first-line managers and 18 percent professionals and 3 percent others.

Measures. Unless stated otherwise, responses were on a seven-point scale, from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). Where other response scales were used this was done to be consistent with previous research.

Job satisfaction was measured with three items from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (as reported in Spector, 1997), for example: "Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job". *Life satisfaction* was measured with three items from Neal, Sirgy and Uysal (1999), for example: 'I am generally happy with my life'. We added a fourth item: 'All in all, I am satisfied with my life as a whole'. Organizational commitment was measured with Meyer and Allen's (1997) six-item *affective commitment* scale, for example: "I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own." *Withdrawal cognitions* were measured with three items, for example: "I often think of quitting this job." *Absence* was measured with a single item "How many days have you been absent from work (not including holidays) over the last 12 months?" (0-2 days, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12, 13-16, 17-24, 24 or more) scored 1-7.

Burnout was measured with nine items taken from Maslach and Jackson's (1981) emotional exhaustion scale with a sample item being "I feel emotionally drained from my work." Respondents were asked "Think about how you feel about your work. How often do you feel each of the following? anchored 1= never and 7 = every day. Overall *job stress* was measure with a four-item scale from Spreitzer et al (1997) with a sample item being "My job is extremely stressful". Empowerment was measured using Spreitzer's (1995, 1996) 12-item psychological empowerment scale. The four sub-scales, meaning, competence, self-determination and impact, were added to provide an overall empowerment construct, as is commonly done in the literature (e.g., Spreitzer, 1995, 1996). Items included: "The work I do is very important to me" (meaning), "I am confident about my ability to do my job" (competence), "I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job" (self-determination), and "My impact on what happens in my department is large" (impact). *Positive affectivity* was measured with three items from Agho et al., (1992), for example: "I live a very interesting life." *Perception of organizational support for careers and training and development* was measured with a 4 item sub-scale from Gould-Williams (2005) with sample items being "I am provided with sufficient opportunities for training and development" and "I have the opportunities I want to be promoted".

Perceptions of family supportive organizational practices were measured with six high loading items drawn from Allen (2001), with a sample item being "It is assumed the most productive employees are those who put their work before their family life" (reverse scored). Family-to-work conflict and work-to-family conflict were measured with two five item scales from (Netmeyer et al, 1996) with sample items, respectively, "The demands of my family interfere with work-related activities"; "The amount of time my job takes up makes it

difficult to fulfill family responsibilities". *Organizational citizenship behavior-organization* (OCB-O) was measured with five items drawn from the compliance dimension of Smith, Organ and Near (1983) representing behaviours targeted at the organization (e.g., "Volunteer for things that are not absolutely required"). *Organizational citizenship behavior-individual* (OCB-I), representing behaviours targeted at individuals, was measured with items (e.g. "Help new people settle into the job", "Help others who have heavy workloads") based on the altruism dimension of Smith, Organ and Near (1983). Responses for both OCB-O and OCB-I were on a five-point scale, reflecting the frequency of engagement in the activity ("never" to "always"). *Hours* worked at home was measured by asking respondents to report the number of hours worked at home in a typical work week in the ranges: under 5, 5-9,10-14,15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, over 60 hours scored 1 to 13.

We included the following *control variables* in our analyses: age (under 20, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-65, over 65) scored 1 to 7, gender (female = 1; male = 0) and marital status (married = 1; single/divorced/other = 0), and total weekly hours worked in a typical work week (under 10, 10-14,15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, over 60 hours) scored 1 to 12.

Results

Mean, standard deviations, correlations and alphas for the study variables are reported in table 1. All the multi-item scales had alphas greater than .7 with the exception of positive affect (.58), stress (.56) and OCB-O (.69) which were slightly below.

Insert table 1 near here

The regression analyses are shown in table 2. Of the control variables, age was positively associated with job satisfaction, life satisfaction, psychological empowerment, perceptions of family friendly work organization, affective commitment and positive affect, and negatively associated with burnout, stress, work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict and withdrawal cognitions. Gender and marital status were in general less important, with gender positively associated with job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, OCB-I and positive effect and negatively associated family-to-work conflict, OCB-O and withdrawal cognitions. Marital status was negatively associated with positive affect and positively associated with OCB-O. Total hours worked was positively associated with affective commitment, psychological empowerment, burnout, stress, work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict OCB and OCB-I, and negatively associated with life satisfaction and withdrawal cognitions. Not surprisingly, it seems that longer working hours in total tends to undermine employee wellbeing.

Insert table 2 near here

Hypothesis 1 suggested that after controlling for total hours worked homeworking will be associated with employee wellbeing. The findings in Table 2 show support for hypotheses 1)a. , 1)b., 1)c. , 1)e., 1)h., and 1)i. with hours worked in the home positively associated with job and life satisfaction, psychological empowerment, positive affect and negatively associated with burnout and stress. We found no significant relationships between hours

worked at home and organizational commitment, withdrawal cognitions, and absenteeism providing no support for hypotheses 1)d., 1)e. and 1)g. These findings provide partial support for hypothesis 1, that homeworking is associated with employee wellbeing.

Hypothesis 2 examined the relationship between homeworking and an employee's perceptions of the organization as supporting their career aspirations and personal development needs. Our suggestion was that homeworking would be negatively associated with perceived career development opportunities. The hypothesis was supported, with a significant negative association providing some support for Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3 concerned the impact of work location on employees' work-life balance. We examined the impact of homeworking on employee's perceptions of their organization as family friendly and the levels of family-to-work and work-to-family conflict. The findings in Table 2 show some support for the positive impact of homeworking hours on work life balance. Hours worked at home were positively associated with perceptions of the organization as family friendly, and negatively associated with family-to-work conflict providing support for hypotheses 3)a. and 3)b. There was no such association for work-to-family conflict, suggesting that working at home provides no help here. It appears that the greater flexibility afforded by working at home helps prevent family responsibilities interfering with work, but that it does not prevent work responsibilities interfering with family life.

Hypothesis 4 concerned the impact of homeworking on OCB-O and OCB-I. The findings in Table 2 show a positive association between total hours worked and both OCB-O and OCB-I,

but there was no significant association between homeworking and OCB, providing no support for hypotheses 4. There is thus no evidence for our suggestion that working at home isolates the individual worker to such an extent that OCB declines.

Discussion and conclusions

There has been a vigorous debate on the impact of new forms of work organization. This has polarized somewhat, with the literature falling into optimistic and pessimistic accounts of the impact of increased alternative location working arrangements. Our findings in this study, on balance, provide some qualified support for the more optimistic perspective of homeworking. We find that homeworking hours are positively associated with employee wellbeing, with hours worked in the home being positively associated with job and life satisfaction, psychological empowerment, and positive affect, and negatively associated with burnout and stress.

However, improved wellbeing of homeworkers may come at a price. One of the main concerns of those most pessimistic about homeworking, that it undermines organizations willingness to invest in the training and development of such workers and negatively impacts on their career progress, found some support in this study. There was a significant negative relationship between hours worked in the home and perceptions of organizational support for career development and training. It seems, at least for managerial and professional employees in knowledge based industries, that homeworking can act as an antidote to the stresses and strains caused by office based working and reduce the negative impact of such work

environments on employee wellbeing, but that this may come at the expense of lower levels of support for career development.

Family friendly working cultures and work-life balance have been one of the key topics of recent HRM research. One of the contributions of this paper is to add some new insights to this debate from the perspective of spatial flexibility. From the general pattern of findings of this study the family-friendly workplace appears to be one with more home-based working. Hours worked at home were positively associated with perceptions of the organization as family friendly, and negatively associated with family-to-work conflict. However, there was no significant association between homeworking and work-to-family conflict. These findings suggest that the greater flexibility afforded by working at home rather than in the office helps prevent family responsibilities interfering with work, but that it does not prevent work responsibilities interfering with family life. On reflection, this pattern of findings is perhaps not too surprising, since working at home is hardly associated with a reduced opportunity for family to interfere with work.

There has been a debate in the alternative location working literature on the impact of such working arrangements on work effort and performance. The advocates of telework often argue for its introduction using a business case based on improved employee productivity (Collins, 2005). We sought to examine this issue by analyzing the impact of homeworking on organizational citizenship behaviours targeted at the organization and individuals. We found that total hours worked was positively associated with both OCB-O and OCB-I, but that homeworking hours were not significantly associated with OCB. The effects of homeworking on OCB appear from our findings to be benign, with no evidence for our suggestion that

OCB would be undermined by homeworking due to lower levels of motivation and opportunity for such behaviours.

An often-voiced argument for why homeworking is not more widely practiced is that employers are concerned about losing control over the efforts of non-office located staff (Felstead, Jewson and Walters, 2003). For example, Tietze and Musson report homeworkers as indulging in the practice of "gift-time" by rewarding themselves with time-off work for efficient working. Our findings on OCB are significant in removing a potentially important argument against the use of homeworking by business organizations anxious to maximimise productivity and performance. It would also be interesting to examine the relationship between homeworking and in-role and organizational performance in other work contexts. This is clearly an area that that would merit further research.

In conclusion, we suggest there is a need to refine the arguments of Daniel et al (2001) in relation to the costs and benefits of homeworking. The overall pattern of findings in this study suggests that there are some costs associated with homeworking for the individual, in terms of reduced career development opportunities, but that homeworking is also associated with employee wellbeing along several dimensions. We have been concerned primarily with the association between homeworking and employee attitudes. We suggest that future research might focus also on the costs and benefits to employers.

Our findings must be interpreted in light of the limitations of the study. First, our findings may be susceptible to common method bias, since our measures all originated from an employee survey. Second, since the study was cross-sectional we cannot make definitive

conclusions on causation. Longitudinal studies would be very useful in allowing us to say more about issues of causation. Third, our data comes from one country, Britain, from one group of employees – managers and professionals, and from knowledge intensive organizations. Whether our findings would replicate in other countries, different groups of workers, and in other sectors remains to be seen. Finally, we suggest that although the study has several limitations, the findings here would seem to suggest that location of work really does matter for the knowledge worker, and that there may be very real benefits to employees in an increase in homeworking, at least for this kind of employee.

References

Agho, A.O., J.L. Price, and C.W. Mueller (1992). 'Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **65**, pp. 185-196.

Allen, T.D. (2001). 'Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **58**, pp. 414-435.

Atkinson, J. (1984). 'Manpower strategies for flexible organizations'. *People Management*, August, pp. 32-35.

Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mould: Women, Men and Time in the New Corporate World*. Free Press, New York.

Baines, S and U. Gelder, (2003). 'What is family friendly about the workplace in the home? The case of self-employed parents and their children'*, New Technology, Work and Employment,* **18**, pp. 223-234.

Bardasi, E. and M. Francesconi (2003). *The Impact of Atypical Employment on Individual Wellbeing: Evidence from a Panel of British Workers.* IESR Working Paper 2003-02, Institute for Social and Economic Research, London.

Beach, B. (1989). *Integrating work and Family Life: The Home-working Family.* Albany, NY, State University of New York Press.

Benson, J. (1998). 'Dual commitment: Contract workers in Australian manufacturing enterprises', *Journal of Management Studies*, **35,** pp. 355-375.

Berg, P.T. and M.E. Velde (2005). 'Relationships of functional flexibility with individual and work factors', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, **20**, pp. 111-129.

Berke, D.L. (2003). 'Coming home again: The challenges and rewards of home-based self-employment', *Journal of Family Issues*, **24**, pp. 513-546.

Bricknell, G. (1996). ‘Time you did your homework”, *Facilities*, **14**, pp. 42-44.

Boris, E. (1994). *Home to Work*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Collins, M. (2005). ‘The (not so simple) case for teleworking: A study of Lloyds of London’, *New Technology Work and Employment*, **20**, pp. 115-131.

Cordery, J. P. Sevastos, W. Mueller and S. Parker (1993). ‘Correlates of employee attitudes toward functional flexibility’, *Human Relations*, **46**, pp. 705-723.

Cousins, R., C.J. MacKay, S.D. Clarke, C. Kelley, P.J. Kelly, and R.H. McCaig (2004). ‘Management Standards' work-related stress in the UK: practical development’, *Work & Stress*, **18**, pp. 113 - 136.

Coverdill, J.E. (2000). ‘Of time, work and family’, *Qualitative Sociology*, **23**, pp.231-240.

Daniels, K., D. Lamond, and P. Standen (2001). ‘Teleworking: Frameworks for organizational research’, *Journal of Management Studies*, **38**, pp. 1151-1185.

Desombre, T., C. Kelliher, F. Macfarlane, and M. Ozbiligin, (2006). ‘Re-Organizing work roles in health care: Evidence from the implementation of functional flexibility’, *British Journal of Management*, **17**, pp. 139-151.

Donnelly, R. (2006). ‘How “free” is the free worker? An investigation into the working arrangements available to knowledge workers’, *Personnel Review*, **35**, pp. 78-97.

Felstead, A. and N. Jewson (2000). *In Work, at Home: Towards an Understanding of Homeworking*. Routledge, London.

Felstead, A., N. Jewson, A. Phizacklea, and S. Walters (2001). ‘Working at home: statistical evidence for seven key hypotheses’, *Work, Employment and Society*, **15**, pp. 215-231.

Felstead, A., N. Jewson, A. Phizacklea, and S. Walters (2002). 'The option to work at home: another privilege for the favoured few*?* *New Technology Work and Employment*, **17**, pp. 204-223.

Felstead, A., N. Jewson, A. Phizacklea and S. Walters (2002). 'Opportunities to work at home in the context of work-life balance', *Human Resource Management Journal,* **12**, pp. 54-76.

Felstead, A., N. Jewson, and S. Walters (2003). 'Managerial control of employees working at home', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, **41**: pp. 241-264.

Frolick, M., R. Wilkes R., and R. Urwiler (1993). 'Teleworking as a workplace alternative: An identification of significant factors in American firms' determination of work-at-home polices', *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, **2**, pp.206-222.

Green F. (2001). 'It's been a hard day's night: the concentration and intensification of work in late twentieth century Britain', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, **39**, pp. 53-80.

Gutek, B.A., A.G. Cohen, and A.M. Konrad (1990). 'Predicting social-sexual behavior at work: A contact hypothesis', *Academy of Management Journal*, **33**, pp. 560-577.

Halford, S. (2005). 'Hybrid workspace: re-spatialisation of work, organization and management', *New Technology Work and Employment,* **20**, pp. 19-33.

Hardhill, I. (2003). 'Editorial: Special issue on Teleworking*', New Technology Work and Employment,* **18**, pp. 167-7.

Harris, H. and C. Brewster (1999). 'The coffee-machine system: How international selection really works', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **10**, pp. 488-50.

Heyes, J. and A. Grey (2001). 'Homeworkers and the national minimum wage: Evidence from the textiles and clothing industry', *Work, Employment and Society*, **15**, pp. 863-873.

Hochschild, A.R. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work,* Metropolitan Books. Seattle.

Huws, U. (1993). *Teleworking in Britain: A Report to the Employment Department.* Employment Department, London.

Jurik, N.C. (1998). 'Getting away and getting by: The experiences of self employed homeworkers', *Work and Occupations*, **25**, pp. 7-35.

Knell, J. (2000). *The Quiet Birth of the Free Worker. A Futures Report.* The Industrial Society, London.

Kossek, E. (2003) 'Face Time'. In D. Ince (Ed.) *Dictionary of the Internet in Computing.* Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Lang, R. (2000) *Office Sprawl: The Evolving Geography of Business.* Centre on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, Brookings Institute Working Paper.

Liden, R.C., S.J. Wayne, M.L. Kraimer, and R.T. Sparrowe (2003). 'The dual commitments of contingent workers: An examination of contingents' commitment to the agency and the organization', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **24**, pp. 609-625.

Maslach, C. and Jackson S.E. (1981). 'The measurement of experienced burnout', *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, **2**, pp. 99-113.

Meyer, J. P. and N.J. Allen (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application.* Sage, Thousand Oaks, Ca.

Millward, L.J., S.A. Haslam, and T. Postmes. (2007). 'Putting employees in their place: The impact of hot desking on organizational and team identification', *Organization Science*, **18**, pp. 547-559.

Moorman, R.H. and L.K. Harland. (2002). 'Temporary employees as good citizens: Factors influencing their OCB performance', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, **17**, pp. 171-187.

Neal, J.D., J. Sirgy, and M. Uysal. (1999). 'The role of satisfaction with leisure/tourism services and experiences in satisfaction with leisure life and overall life', *Journal of Business Research*, **44**, pp.153-163.

Netmeyer, R.G., J.S. Boles, and R. McMurrian (1996). 'Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **81**, 400-410.

Organ, D.W., P.M. Podsakoff and S.B. Mackenzie, (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Perlow, L.A. (1997). *Finding Time: How Corporations, Individuals, and Families Can Benefit from New Work Practices*, ILR Press, New York.

Podsakoff, P. M., and S.B. Mackenzie (1997). 'The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research', *Human Performance*, **10**, pp. 133-151.

Podsakoff, P. M., S.B. Mackenzie, R.H. Moorman, and R. Fetter (1990). 'Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors', *Leadership Quarterly*, **1**, pp. 107-142.

Smith, A. C., D.W. Organ, and J.P. Near (1983). 'Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **68,** pp. 653-63.

Spector P.E (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*. Sage, New York.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). 'Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation', *Academy of Management Journal,* **38**, pp. 1442-1465.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1996). 'Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment', *Academy of Management Journal,* **39**, pp. 483-504.

Spreitzer, G., M.A. Kizilos, and S.W. Nason (1997). 'A dimensional analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and effectiveness satisfaction, and strain', *Journal of Management*, **23**, pp. 679-704.

Sullivan, C. and S. Lewis (2001). 'Home-based telework, gender and the synchronization of work and family: Perspectives of teleworkers and their co-residents', *Gender, Work, and Organization*, **8**, pp.123-145.

Tietze, S. and G. Musson, (2005). 'Recasting the home-work relationship: A case of mutual adjustment?', *Organization Studies*, **26**, pp. 1331-1352.

Tremblay, M., B. Sire and A. Pelchat (2004). 'A study of the determinants and of the impacts of flexibility on employee benefit satisfaction'. *Human Relations*, **51**, pp. 667-688.

Williams, L. J., and S.E. Anderson (1991). 'Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors', *Journal of Management,* **17**, pp. 601-617.

Williams, P. (2005). 'Leveraging change in the working conditions of UK homeworkers', *Development in Practice*, **15**, pp. 546-558.

Bios

Tom Redman is Professor of Human Resource Management in Durham Business School, University of Durham. His current research includes projects on leadership, human resource management and organizational, occupational and union commitment.

Ed Snape is a Professor in the Department of Management at the Hong Kong Baptist University. He is a Visiting Professor at the School of Management, University of Bradford. His research interests include organizational, union and occupational commitment, and their implications for citizenship behaviours and participation.

Colin Ashurst is FME Senior Teaching Fellow in Information Systems and Business Transformation in Durham Business School, Durham University. His research interests include IS strategy - identifying opportunities and priorities for IS investments; realizing benefits from IS investments; succeeding with projects and programmes to deliver organizational change, particularly where business innovation and change are significant; improving the productivity of knowledge work; and building the organisational capability to succeed in realising value from the IS investment portfolio.

Table 1 - Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities and Correlations Among the Study Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Marital status	.66	.47	--									
2. Age	3.46	1.12	.48***	--								
3. Gender	.38	.49	-.21***	-.21***	--							
4. Total hours	8.88	1.41	.04	.14***	-.17***	--						
5. Home hours	2.82	1.34	.18***	.24***	-.15***	.22***	--					
6. Job satisfaction	5.14	1.22	.07*	.16***	.03	.10**	.12***	.88				
7. Life satisfaction	5.45	.87	.10**	.11**	.03	-.11**	.08*	.36***	.85			
8. Burnout	3.98	1.49	-.19***	-.34***	.04	. 13***	-.19***	-.40***	-.30***	.94		
9. Stress	5.17	1.33	-.18***	-.21***	.01	.29***	-.14***	-.15***	-.19***	.71***	.56	
10. Affective commitment	4.86	1.19	.01	.09**	.03	.19***	.00	.64***	.18***	-.10**	.14***	.87
11. Empowerment	5.35	.91	.25***	.41***	-.13***	.28***	.26***	.54***	.32***	- .33***	-.05	.43***
12. Positive Affect	5.19	.82	-.08*	.02	.12***	-.00	.13***	.25***	.47***	-.30***	-.20***	.05
13. Family-friendly Org	4.01	.95	.17***	.24***	-.06	.01	.18***	.52***	.20***	- .55***	-.34***	.40***
14. Work-family conflict	4.51	1.34	.03	-.04	-.09**	.43***	.07*	-.10**	-.18***	.54***	.58***	.13**
15. Family-work conflict	3.33	1.30	-.10**	-.23***	-.04	.06	-.10***	-.06	-.10**	.55***	.46***	.19***
16 Absence	1.37	.89	.08*	.07*	.04	-.03	.01	-.10**	.03	-.06	.00	-.05
17. Withdrawal cognitions	3.50	1.38	-.09*	-.20***	-.04	-.10**	-.05	-.70***	-.26***	.18***	.01	-.71***
18. OCB-O	3.65	.70	.14***	.11**	-.15***	.38***	.07*	.13***	.09**	.18***	. 28***	.27***
19.OCB-I	3.15	.70	.02	-.03	.14***	.08*	.01	.12***	.11**	-.20**	-.14***	.08*
20. Career/development support	4.66	1.23	.08*	.07*	.02	.05	-.04	.56***	.22***	-.10**	.02	.50***

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

(table continues)

$N = 749$

Note. Scale reliabilities are on the diagonal.

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
11. Empowerment	.88									
12. Positive Affect	.20***	.58								
13. Family-friendly org	.40***	.14***	.72							
14. Family-work conflict	.09**	-.20***	-.34***	.88						
15. Work-family conflict	-.06	-.17***	-.33***	.52***	.89					
16. Absence	.00	-.04	.00	-.04	-.09**	--				
17. Withdrawal cognitions	-.43**	-.06	-.39***	-.02	-.06	.09**	.71			
18. OCB-O	.40***	-.02	.02	.43***	.29***	-.00	-.15***	.69		
19. OCB-I	.08*	.17***	.13***	-.08*	-.20***	.01	-.12***	.22***	.74	
20. Career/development support	.34***	.02	.30***	.00	.12***	.07*	-.61***	.14***	.07*	.79

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

(table continues)

$N = 749$.

Note. Scale reliabilities are on the diagonal.

Table 2 – Results of hierarchical regression for the effects of hours worked at home

Variable	Job satisfaction β	Life satisfaction β	Burnout β	Stress β
Step 1				
Marital status	-.01	.04	-.01	-.07
Age	.16***	.09*	-.34***	-.19***
Gender	.084*	.05	-.02	-.00
Total hours	.06	-.12***	.20***	.35***
ΔR^2	.04***	.03***	.15***	.16***
Step 2				
Home hours	.08*	.09*	-.15***	-.15***
ΔR^2	.01*	.01*	.02***	.02***
R^2	.04	.03	.17	.17
F	7.95***	6.31***	35.66***	37.92***

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

$N = 749$. *Note.* Standardized regression coefficients from the final equation (step2) are shown.

Table 2 continued – Results of hierarchical regression for the effects of hours worked at home

Variable	Family friendly org β	Work to Family conflict β	Family to Work conflict β	Development β
Step 1				
Marital status	.05	.07	.01	.08
Age	.19***	-.14***	-.24***	.05
Gender	-.00	-.04	-.08*	.05
Total hours	-.03	.43***	.10**	.05
ΔR^2	.06***	.19***	.07***	.01*
Step 2				
Home hours	.13***	-.01	-.07*	-.07*
ΔR^2	.01***	.00	.01*	.01*
R^2	.07	.19	.07	.01
F	14.19***	41.84***	13.38***	2.83*

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

$N = 749$. *Note.* Standardized regression coefficients from the final equation (step2) are shown.

Table 2 continued – Results of hierarchical regression for the effects of hours worked at home

Variable	Affective commitment β	Positive Affect β	OCB-O β	OCB-I β
Step 1				
Marital status	-.04	-.13***	.11**	.05
Age	.11**	.09*	-.00	-.03
Gender	.08*	.14***	-.08*	.16***
Total hours	.20***	-.03	.37***	.11**
ΔR^2	.05***	.03***	.16***	.03***
Step 2				
Home hours	-.05	.16***	-.04	.01
ΔR^2	.00	.02***	.00	.00
R^2	.05	.05	.16	.03
F	9.59***	9.81***	34.59***	5.64***

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

$N = 749$. *Note.* Standardized regression coefficients from the final equation (step2) are shown.

Table 2 continued – Results of hierarchical regression for the effects of hours worked at home

Variable	Psychological empowerment β	Withdrawal cognitions β
Step 1		
Marital status	.06	.01
Age	.34***	-.22***
Gender	-.01	-.10**
Total hours	.20***	-.09*
ΔR^2	.23***	.06***
Step 2		
Home hours	.13***	.00
ΔR^2	.02***	.00
R^2	.25	.05
F	57.57***	10.40***

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

$N = 749$. *Note.* Standardized regression coefficients from the final equation (step2) are shown.